

PERMITS COMPARISON (DRAFT)

Comparison Between the Requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01, the Federal NPDES Storm Water Regulations, the Existing San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (Order No. 90-42), and Previous Drafts of the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit

Conclusions

- 1. Urban runoff causes or contributes to the impairment of every known impaired water body in the San Diego Region** (i.e., every 303(d) listed water body in the Region is impaired, at least in part, because of urban runoff).
- 2. During the past 10 years (the period during which the Copermittees have been subject to Order No 90-42), water quality in the Region has continued to decline. The decline is the result of the increasing urban runoff pollution associated with the growth of the Region** (i.e., increasing urban development and human population).
- 3. The continued degradation of the Region's receiving waters is evidence that current efforts to control urban runoff are not working** (i.e., current Copermittee Urban Runoff Management Programs under Order No. 90-42 are either inadequate or ineffective). In other words, we are losing the battle against urban runoff pollution.
- 4. More must be done to reduce urban runoff pollutants if the beneficial uses (e.g., fishing, swimming, aquatic habitat, etc.) of the Region's receiving waters are to be protected.**
- 5. Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (the proposed renewal of Order No 90-42) is the answer. If properly implemented, Tentative Order 2001-01 will significantly "slow the current rate" of water quality degradation in San Diego. Furthermore, the Tentative Order has the potential to "improve" the quality of San Diego receiving waters over the long term (i.e., 10-20 years).**
- 6. Tentative Order No. 2001-01 is the product of an evolving development process that has included the release of two previous drafts and spanned more than six years.** The Tentative Order incorporates the SDRWQCB's responses to over 200 pages of public comments on the 1995 and 1998 drafts of the permit.
- 7. Because Order No. 90-42, the interim drafts, and Tentative Order No. 2001-01 are all based on the same 1990 federal regulations, the underlying objectives and essential requirements of these documents are all "fundamentally the same".** In other words, Tentative Order No. 2001-01 is not a "new" permit. It has the same underlying objectives and requirements as Order No. 90-42, the "early" first round permit to which the Copermittees have been subject for the past ten years.

8. **Although fundamentally very similar, Tentative Order 2001-01 will require Copermittees to do more and to expend a greater level of effort than is currently required under Order No. 90-42.**
9. **Relative to Order No. 90-42, the requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01 are significantly expanded in that they are more numerous, more specific/detailed, and more stringent than the requirements in Order No. 90-42.** The SDRWQB believes that the expanded requirements are justified and necessary in light of the declining quality of the Region's receiving waters.
10. **Approximately 80% of the requirements contained in Tentative Order No 2001-01 are also contained in the second draft of the permit released October 1998.** This means approximately 80% of the permit requirements have been known to the Copermittees (and available for their review and implementation) for at least two years.
11. **The remaining 20% of the requirements in the Tentative Order are "new", meaning that they have been added within the past two years.** If 80% of the permit has been known for at least two years, then theoretically, the Copermittees have had the recent 51 day review period (ending Nov 30, 2000) to assimilate the new remaining 20% of the permit¹.
12. **Greater than 40% of the requirements contained in Tentative Order No 2001-01 are also contained in the Copermittee's current first round permit, Order No. 90-42.** This means that at least 40% of the Tentative Order's requirements have been known to the Copermittees for the past ten years. Accordingly, a Copermittee that is currently in compliance with Order No. 90-42 will have at least 40% of the Tentative Order's requirements already met and fully implemented during the past ten years.
13. **Of the 80% of the Tentative Order's requirements that have been known to the Copermittees for at least two years, half (or 50% of 80%) have been known to the Copermittees for no less than 10 years and half have been known for no less than two years.**
14. **Approximately 60% of the requirements in Tentative Order 2001-01 are based solely on the 1990 federal NPDES Storm Water Regulations. The remaining 40% of the requirements in the Tentative Order "exceed the federal regulations". Requirements that "exceed the federal regulations" are either more numerous, more specific/detailed, or more stringent than the requirements in the regulations.**
15. **The 40% of the requirements in Tentative Order 2001-01 which "exceed the federal regulations" are based almost exclusively on (1) guidance documents**

¹ Current law requires a 45 day comment period.

developed by USEPA²; and (2) SWRCB's orders describing statewide precedent setting decisions on MS4s permits³.

- 16. The SDRWQCB is authorized to include requirements in the Tentative Order which "exceed the federal regulations" under both section 402(p)(3)(iii) of the Clean Water Act, as well as section 13377 of the California Water Code.** In the course of carrying out its mission, the SDRWQCB is authorized to require any more stringent controls it deems necessary to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters, address specific local problems (e.g., beach closures), implement water quality control plans, or prevent nuisance.
- 17. Taken as a whole, the requirements contained in Tentative Order 2001-01 represent the SDRWQCB's interpretation/definition of MEP for the San Diego Region.** MEP, or the maximum extent practicable, is the technology-based standard established by Congress for municipal dischargers of urban runoff (i.e., MS4 dischargers).
- 18. The inclusion in a renewal MS4 permit (e.g., Order No. 2001-01) of requirements that are more stringent than those in an initial MS4 permit is supported by USEPA⁴ and the SWRCB⁵.** Over time it is expected that subsequent MS4 permits will require an increasing level of effort on the part of the municipalities that is commensurate with the need to protect beneficial uses. This is particularly appropriate where the initial permit was an "early" permit.
- 19. SDRWQCB has Ample Legal Authority to Adopt Tentative Order No. 2001-01.** Each of the requirements contained in Tentative Order is solidly grounded in the Clean Water Act, the California Water Code, the federal storm water regulations, USEPA guidance documents on MS4 permits, and SWRCB Orders relating to MS4 permits.

Comparison Table

The attached table, showing the development process of Tentative Order No. 2001-01, is provided to call attention to the similarities and differences between the requirements of

² Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part 2 of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

³ In Orders WQ 98-01 and 99-05, the SWRCB prescribed specific precedent setting Receiving Water Limitations language to be included in all future MS4 permits. On October 5, 2000 the SWRCB made its final decision to uphold the LARWQCB's adoption of Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) requirements for new development in MS4 permits.

⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1996. Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits. 61 FR 43761.

⁵ On October 5, 2000 the SWRCB made its final decision to uphold the LARWQCB's adoption of Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) for new development in MS4 permits.

Tentative Order No. 2001-01 and the current San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (Order No. 90-42). Additionally the table compares both the existing and proposed permits, as well as the two previous drafts, to the 1990 federal NPDES Storm Water Regulations for Phase I (federal regulations)⁶.

The orders, regulations, and drafts are presented in the table chronologically so that the evolution of the Tentative Order's requirements is evident over time. The differences and similarities between the various documents can be observed in the table by noting the number of "X's" in each column. An "X" indicates that a given requirement is included in the document; while a "-" means that the requirement is missing.

Order No. 90-42 was the first document included in the table to be issued (in July of 1990), and has the least number of requirements. As the table indicates, Order 90-42 was an "early" permit, in that it was released prior to the November 1990 promulgation of the Federal NPDES storm water regulations. Although Order No. 90-42 contained the "essentials" of the 1990 regulations, the requirements were written in very broad generic and often vague terms. Broad generic terms were incorporated into the permit for the purpose of providing the maximum amount of flexibility to the Copermittees in implementing the new requirements (flexibility was, in fact, the stated reason for issuing the permit in advance of the final regulations).

When the federal regulations were issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) in November of 1990, they were significantly more detailed and contained more requirements than Order No. 90-42. **The federal regulations, which implement and clarify the federal statute, specify the minimum fundamental or essential requirements that must be contained in all municipal storm water permits.** For this reason, the existing, proposed, and previous drafts of San Diego Municipal Storm Water permit are based on, and grounded in, the federal regulations. It is to the federal regulations that each of the documents in the table should be ultimately compared. To enhance understanding and clarify the federal regulations, USEPA's intent in drafting the regulations was expanded upon in the "Preamble" to the federal regulations and in several guidance documents (which provide further detail and insight on USEPA intent). These supporting documents have also been relied upon in developing the requirements of the Tentative Order and its previous drafts.

Five Fundamental Requirements of an MS4 Permit

When distilled down to its essence, the federal regulations direct that municipalities implement an Urban Runoff Management Program that, at a minimum, includes the five following fundamental requirements:

⁶ The 1990 final phase I NPDES federal storm water regulations, codified at 40CFR 122.26, implement and interpret section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act. Section 402(p) is the section of the Clean Water Act that requires municipalities to obtain an NPDES permit for their discharges of storm water. The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act added section 402(p). The Clean Water Act is the 1976 federal statute which requires NPDES permits to regulate point source discharges of pollutants to waters of the United States.

1. Prohibit non-storm water discharges into MS4s.
2. Implement best management practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutant discharges into MS4s to the maximum extent practicable (MEP).
3. Ensure that discharges from the MS4 do not cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in receiving waters.
4. Identify (actively find) and eliminate sources of illicit discharges.
5. Enforce local ordinances and permits.

Need for Increased Permit “Specificity”

The table below demonstrates the increase in permit specificity over time. There are several important reasons for the increase in the specificity of the permit language, which are discussed below.

1. Copermittees Requested Increased Specificity; Tentative Order 2001-01 provides Increased Specificity

Copermittees have repeatedly requested that the SDRWQCB define the minimum levels of actions/efforts required on their parts to keep them in minimum compliance with Order No. 90-42. As previously explained, the early permit was purposely written in broad terms to provide maximum flexibility the Copermittees. For example, Order No. 90-42 directs the Copermittees to develop and implement a comprehensive Urban Runoff Management Program, but unlike the Tentative Order, provides very little direction or detail on what that program must contain, and even less direction on minimum levels of effort required for compliance. As a result, many Copermittees frequently ask the SDRWQCB to provide direction and specificity on these topics. Tentative Order No. 2001-01 directly responds to this request by specifying minimum required program components, as well as the minimum elements of each component. These types of definitions require specific language, rather than broad directives, since they convey all of the activities expected of the Copermittees. In this way, the Tentative Order defines the minimum level of effort needed for compliance. A permit which describes each of the activities to be conducted will be greater in length and detail than a permit that does not. Although responsive to the Copermittees’ request, much of the specifics provided in the Tentative Order had already been provided to the Copermittees over ten years ago in the form of the federal regulations.

2. Copermittees Requested that MEP be Defined; Tentative Order 2001-01 Defines MEP

Maximum Extent Practicable or MEP is the technology-based standard established by Congress in the Clean Water Act (section 402(p)(3)(B)(iii)) that municipal dischargers of storm water must meet. Technology-based standards establish the level of pollutant

reductions that dischargers must achieve, typically by treatment or by a combination of treatment and source control BMPs. In this case, municipal dischargers are required to reduce the discharge of pollutants into and from their MS4s to the MEP. The MEP standard therefore provides specificity about the minimum amount of effort needed for permit compliance. MEP considers economics and is generally, but not necessarily, less stringent than BAT⁷. A definition of MEP is not provided either in the statute or in the regulations. Instead the definition of MEP is dynamic and is intended to be defined over time by the following process: municipalities propose their definition of MEP by way of their Urban Runoff Management Programs. The total collective and individual activities conducted pursuant to their Urban Runoff Management Programs become their “proposal” for MEP, as it applies both to their overall management program and level of effort, as well as to any specific activity (e.g., what is MEP for street sweeping, or MEP for sanitary sewer maintenance?).

In a memorandum dated February 11, 1993 entitled “Definition of Maximum Extent Practicable,” Elizabeth Jennings, Senior Staff Counsel for the SWRCB writes “...to achieve the MEP standard, municipalities must employ whatever best management practices (BMPs) are technically feasible (i.e., are likely to be effective) and are not cost prohibitive”. She goes on to state, in part, “...The final determination regarding whether a municipality has reduced pollutants to the maximum extent practicable can only be made by the Regional or State Water Boards, and not by the municipal discharger.”

Tentative Order No. 2001-01 defines MEP in the San Diego Region. The overall program scope and level of effort specified in the Tentative Order’s Urban Runoff Management Programs is the SDRWQCB’s interpretation of MEP. By defining the minimum standard, the SDRWQCB has eliminated much of the guesswork and uncertainty previously associated with permit compliance.

3. Copermittees Provided Substantial Comments on Previous Drafts; Tentative Order No. 2001-01 Responds to All Comments Received

Tentative Order No. 2001-01 is detailed in its requirements in part due to the extended reissuance process it has undergone. Drafts of the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit have been released for public comment twice before (in 1995 and 1998). During the course of development, the SDRWQCB has asked for and received a significant number of comments on previous drafts (informally during individual discussions and collective meetings, as well as formally in more than 200 pages of written comments). Each comment has been carefully reviewed and considered. The language in Tentative Order No. 2001-01 incorporates the SDRWQCB’s responses to all comments received prior to its release on October 11, 2000.

Over the years and in a variety of forums, both the Copermittees and the public have generally sought more clarification and detailed explanations of permit requirements.

⁷ BAT, or best available technology, is the technology-based standard established by Congress for industrial dischargers of storm water.

Many of the comments received on earlier drafts have contained specific requests for the SDRWQCB to provide additional clarification or specificity on a variety of permit requirements.

In response to these comments, the level of detail of the Tentative Order has increased over time. This evolution can be seen in the attached table by the increasing number of requirements in each subsequent issuance of the Tentative Order (note totals at end of table). Tentative Order 2001-01 provides the additional clarification and increased specificity requested, while seeking to address the entire scope and variety of issues raised during the lengthy public participation process. One consequence of an extended development process and repeated requests for greater specificity, is that overall volume of the permit has also increased proportionately over the years. It may be interesting to note that many of the “very recently received” comments on Tentative Order 2001-01 continue to request additional clarification on specific requirements.

4. Greater Specificity Will Facilitate Assessment Of Copermittee Compliance

Assessing Copermittee compliance with Order No. 40-42 has been challenging and resource intensive. There are many reasons for this including the following:

- Storm water permits are based on BMPs and lack numeric effluent limits
- MEP, the technology based standard for MS4 permits, had not been defined
- Order No. 90-42 was an “early” permit with broad vague language
- Order No. 90-42 lacked other “measurable” performance standards
- Storm water management is a developing field (most other discharges regulated by the SDRWQCB are well defined)

With respect to assessing permit compliance, a storm water permit’s lack of numeric effluent limitations is a distinct disadvantage. This is because compliance (or noncompliance) with numeric effluent limitations is one of the most important tools used by the regional boards in their overall assessment of a discharger’s compliance. The comparison of routine effluent monitoring data to the numeric effluent limitations specified in the permit provides an accurate and effective measure of permit compliance.

In contrast, assessing compliance with Order No. 90-42, a BMP-based “early” storm water permit, has proven complex and subjective. When effluent limits are absent, the inclusion of greater specificity is made all the more necessary. Reliance on BMPs, as opposed to numeric effluent limits, demands specification of those programs and activities that are relied upon to reduce pollution. To assess compliance with the early permit, the SDRWQCB has utilized a variety of other tools, with varying degrees of effectiveness (See “Status of Copermittee Compliance”, Attachment 16).

Tentative Order 2001-01 now contains detailed narrative descriptions of its requirements that represent the SDRWQCB’s definition of MEP. Such detailed requirements remove ambiguity by clearing spelling out the SDRWQCB’s minimum expectations. In summary,

the increased specificity of the Tentative Order will greatly enhance a Copermittee's, the SDRWQCB's, or other interested party's ability to assess permit compliance.

Need For Increased Permit "Stringency" - - Exceeding the Federal Regulations

There has also been an increase in number of and stringency of permit requirements over time. As can be seen in the table below, Order No. 2001-01 requires considerably more of Copermittees than does Order No. 90-42. Furthermore, in some respects, the requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01 exceed the minimum requirements as specified in the federal regulations. The need for increased stringency and to exceed the federal regulations is discussed below.

1. Continuing Water Quality Degradation Requires Increased Stringency

The increasing impairment of our Region's waters due to urban runoff (as discussed on page 5 of the Fact Sheet/Technical Report, provided as Attachment 7 of Agenda Item 5) demands increased stringency in municipal storm water permits. The population and urban development of our Region has expanded dramatically since Order No. 90-42 was issued ten years ago, and the resulting water quality problems have mirrored this expansion. The closure or posting of local beaches has become all too familiar. Urban runoff now directly causes or contributes to all of the known receiving water quality impairments in the San Diego Region. The importance of water quality to our region's tourism industry and way of life has caused an increase in public outcry against urban runoff contamination and beach closures. Urban runoff issues are now a common site on our Region's newspaper headlines and governing body agendas. Legislation at the state level regarding water quality (such as AB 411) is being generated within our Region due in large part to the Region's pronounced urban runoff water quality issues.

The continued degradation of the Region's receiving water is evidence that the current collective efforts of the Copermittees to control urban runoff are either ineffective or inadequate. More must be done to reduce urban runoff pollution if the beneficial uses of the Region's receiving waters are to be protected. The more stringent requirements of the Tentative Order are needed to address these problems and the increased attention and expectations that accompany them.

2. Tentative Order Reflects a Decade of Evolving Technology

Versions of the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit have also become increasingly stringent due to the advancing progress in urban runoff management and technology which has occurred over time. Tentative Order No. 2001-01, and its requirements, reflect a 10 year evolution in the field of urban runoff management. Information on the impacts of urban runoff, as well as how to minimize these impacts, have greatly expanded since the existing Municipal Storm Water Permit for San Diego was first issued in 1990. In 1990, very few reference materials were available to Copermittees. Today there is a large and growing body of excellent resources available.

The Tentative Order takes advantage of this increased knowledge and the passage of time, by including additional requirements which have been proven effective or which are necessary to protect receiving waters from increasing urban runoff pollution. The result of the technology evolution is a longer and more detailed, but also more effective, permit.

3. Increased Stringency is Supported by USEPA and SWRCB

The increased specificity included in the Tentative Order is in large part derived from USEPA's guidance as provided in its *Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part 2 of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems*⁸ and its *Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits*.⁹ Where the Tentative Order is more stringent than the federal regulations, the stringency is frequently based on the recommendations of the Guidance Manual. USEPA's guidance and the 1999 Phase II Storm Water regulations indicate that MS4 permits are to increase in stringency when reissued, especially where beneficial uses of receiving waters are not being protected.

The Interim Permitting Approach also supports increased specificity in storm water permits, recommending that municipal storm water permits use "best management practices (BMPs) in first-round storm water permits, and **expanded or better-tailored BMPs in subsequent permits**, where necessary, to provide for the attainment of water quality standards. In cases where adequate information exists to develop more specific conditions or limitations to meet water quality standards, these conditions or limitations are to be incorporated into storm water permits, as necessary and appropriate" (emphasis added). It is important to note that the SWRCB cited USEPA's Interim Permitting Approach as support for its recent tentative decision which upheld the increased specificity of numeric sizing criteria requirements for post-construction BMPs as appropriate requirements in municipal storm water permits. This SWRCB decision supporting Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMPs) demonstrates the SWRCB's general recognition of the need for increased requirements in municipal storm water permits.

The SWRCB's decision to require MS4 discharges to meet water quality standards also supports increased specificity in municipal storm water permits. In Orders WQ 98-01 and 99-05, the SWRCB prescribed specific precedent setting Receiving Water Limitations language to be included in all future MS4 permits. This language specifically requires that MS4 dischargers meet water quality standards and allows for the use of narrative BMPs (increasing in stringency and implemented in an iterative process) as the mechanism by which water quality standards can be met. The idea of an iterative process

⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Part 2 of the NPDES Permit Applications for Discharges from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems. EPA 833-B-92-002.

⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1996. Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits. 61 FR 43761.

of increasingly stringent BMP implementation is consistent with the concept of increasingly stringent MS4 permits. For example, increasingly stringent BMP implementation is required for discharges to impaired water bodies; likewise, increasingly stringent MS4 permits are required for regions with numerous water bodies impaired by urban runoff.

The SWRCB clearly expresses its intent that MS4 permits should increase in stringency in a manner similar to increasingly stringent BMP implementation when it states in a recent memorandum “[...] **because most MS4 discharges enter impaired water bodies, there is a real need for permits to include stringent requirements to protect those water bodies. As total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) are developed, it is likely that MS4s will have to participate in pollutant load reductions, and the MS4 permits are the most effective vehicles for those reductions.**”

In summary, Tentative Order No. 2001-01 is consistent with USEPA and SWRCB support for increasing stringency in MS4 permits as necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the Region’s receiving waters from further impairment.

Tentative Order 2001-01 Is Fundamentally The Same As Order No. 90-42

The “early” permit and each of the drafts of the renewal permit as well as the federal regulations (from which the essential requirements are derived) all have the same basic objective, namely, to reduce pollutants in urban runoff discharges to receiving waters. As shown in the table below, each of the documents also contain each of the fundamental underlying requirements specified in the federal regulations.

From a broad brush perspective, (even though differing substantially in level of detail and number of pages), each version of the Order is fundamentally the same. Tentative Order No. 2001-01 is not a “new” permit. It has the same underlying objective and contains the same essential ingredients as Order No. 90-42, the “early” permit to which the Copermittees have been subject for the past ten years.

The comparisons table clearly shows that the number, specificity, and stringency of permit requirements has increased over time throughout the permit development process. Perhaps more importantly however, the table also demonstrates that the most fundamental requirements, as specified in the federal regulations, have remained the same through time and that each are contained in Order No. 90-42, in the Tentative Order, and in both of the previous drafts.

Furthermore because the language contained in Order No. 90-42 and the federal regulations is quite broad, the basic requirements typically encompass or embody the more enhanced requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01 and previous drafts. For example, with regards to requirements for enforcement by the Copermittees, Order No. 90-42 simply states “Pursue enforcement actions as necessary to ensure compliance [...].” Though this statement is relatively broad, it embodies the more specific requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01, such as the Tentative Order’s requirements

to “enforce ordinances and permits as necessary [at construction, industrial, and commercial sites] to maintain compliance with the Order.” In a reciprocal manner, most of the requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01 are embodied in Order No. 90-42 and the federal NPDES storm water regulations. Footnotes to the table are occasionally provided to exhibit these types of circumstances.

The similarity of the various order, drafts, and regulations included in the table can also be observed when the number of requirements in each document are tallied. For example, roughly 80% of the Tentative Order’s requirements were also present in the 1998 draft of the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit. Even the requirements of Order No. 90-42 encompass roughly 40% of the requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01. This exhibits the similarity in the requirements of the various documents covered in the table, and also demonstrates that the majority of the requirements of Tentative Order No. 2001-01 have been presented for public review prior to the public release of the Tentative Order.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Prohibition of Various Types of Discharges (Section A., page 8 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Prohibit discharges into and from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) causing pollution, contamination, or nuisance	X	X	X	X	X
	Prohibit discharges from MS4s causing exceedances of water quality objectives	X	X	X	X	X
	Prohibit discharges into and from MS4s containing pollutants which have not been reduced to maximum extent practicable (MEP)	X	X	X	X	X
	Prohibit post-development runoff from new development which is greater in peak rate or velocity than pre-development runoff from the same site	-	-	X	X	X
	Prohibit discharges of post-development runoff into a Clean Water Act section 303(d) water body containing any pollutant (for which the water body is already impaired) in levels exceeding predevelopment levels (for those same pollutants)	-	-	-	-	X
	Prohibit discharges from MS4s as required by Basin Plan Prohibitions	X	N/A	X	X	X
Prohibitions of Non-Storm Water Discharges (Section B., page 9 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Prohibit non-storm water discharges, except de minimis discharges	X	X	X	X	X
	Prohibit de minimis discharges if source of pollutants or require BMPs for the discharges	X	X	X	X	X
	For de minimis discharges not prohibited, submit information on discharge not prohibited and what BMPs will be required	-	-	X	X	X
	Require BMPs for non-emergency fire fighting flows which are significant sources of pollutants	-	X	X	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Prohibit non-prohibited non-storm water discharges with pollutants which can't be reduced to MEP	X	X	X	X	X
Receiving Water Limitations (Section C., page 10 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Prohibit discharges causing violation of water quality standards	X	X	X	X	X
	If exceedance of water quality standards occurs, implement control measures stop exceedance	X	X	-	X	X
	If exceedance of water quality standards occurs, notify SDRWQCB of exceedance and submit report to SDRWQCB of measures to be taken	X	-	-	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	If exceedance of water quality standards occurs, revise urban runoff management program and monitoring program, and implement the programs	-	-	-	X	X
Legal Authority (Section D., page 10 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Establish, maintain, and enforce legal authority to control pollutant discharges into and from MS4	X ¹⁰	X ¹¹	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to control pollutant discharges from industrial and construction activities into MS4	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to prohibit all illicit discharges	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to prohibit and eliminate illicit connections	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to control discharge of spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other than storm water into MS4	X	X	X	X	X

¹⁰ Much of the language in Order No. 90-42 regarding the Copermittees' attainment of legal authority is very broad. It states "Enact legislation and ordinances as necessary to ensure compliance with the stormwater management program and the implementation plans." SDRWQCB interprets this language as requiring the establishment of legal authority to control all pollutant discharges into and from the MS4. Therefore, all requirements regarding the attainment of legal authority for the purpose of controlling pollutant discharges into and from the MS4 are "checked" in the Order No. 90-42 column.

¹¹ The Federal NPDES regulations require Copermittees to operate pursuant to legal authority which enables them to "[R]equire compliance with conditions in ordinances, permits, contracts, and orders" (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(i)(E)). Therefore, the Federal NPDES regulations require the Copermittees to have legal authority to comply with requirements in orders from the SDRWQCB. Accordingly, legal authority requirements necessary to ensure compliance with SDRWQCB orders are "checked" in the Federal NPDES Regulations column.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to require compliance with Copermittee ordinances, permits, contracts, or orders	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to utilize enforcement mechanisms	X	X	X ¹²	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to control pollutants from one portion of shared MS4 to another through interagency agreements	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to carry out inspections, surveillance, and monitoring necessary to determine compliance	X	X	X	X	X
	Establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to require the use of BMPs	X	X	X	X	X
	Provide certified statement that Copermittee has adequate legal authority	-	-	X	X	X
	Provide certified statement that identifies responsibilities of each municipal department which conducts urban runoff activities	-	-	X	-	X
	Provide certified statement citing urban runoff related ordinances and how they are enforceable	-	-	X	-	X
	Provide certified statement describing how ordinances are implemented and appealed	-	-	X	-	X

¹² The 1995 Draft requires legal authority to be obtained which authorizes the Copermittee to “[R]equire compliance with conditions in ordinances, permits, contracts, or orders.” Legal authority to “require compliance” is analogous to legal authority to “enforce.” Therefore, the requirement to “establish legal authority which authorizes Copermittee to utilize enforcement mechanisms” is “checked” in the 1995 Draft column.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Provide certified statement describing issuance of administrative orders and injunctions or use of court system for enforcement actions	-	-	-	-	X
Technology Based Standards (Section E., page 12 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	BMPs shall be implemented to reduce pollutants discharges into and from the MS4 to the MEP	X	X	X	X	X
	Pollutant discharges into and from the MS4 from industrial activity owned by the Copermittee shall be reduced to BAT/BCT	-	X	X	X	X
	Pollutant discharges into and from the MS4 from construction activity owned by the Copermittee shall be reduced to BAT/BCT	-	X	X	X	X
Urban Runoff Management Plan (Section F., page 13 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Implement urban runoff management plan to reduce discharge of pollutants into and from MS4	X	X	X	X	X
Land-Use Planning for New Development and Significant Redevelopment (Section F.1., page 13 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutant discharges from new development and redevelopment to the MEP	X	X	X	X	X
	Utilize urban planning to minimize discharge of pollutants in urban runoff	X	X	X	X	X
	Minimize short and long-term impacts on receiving water quality from new development and redevelopment	-	-	-	-	X
	Incorporate water quality and watershed principles into General Plan	-	-	-	-	X
	Modify development project approval processes	-	-	X	X	X
	Include conditions of approval in local permits for new development	-	-	X	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Revise environmental review processes and CEQA initial study checklists	-	-	-	X	X
	Conduct education efforts focused on new development and redevelopment	-	-	-	-	X
	Educate municipal staff on requirements for new development and redevelopment	-	-	X	X	X
	Educate project applicants, contractors, developers, property owners, etc. on requirements for new development and redevelopment	-	-	X	X	X
Land-Use Planning for New Development and Significant Redevelopment (SUSMPs) (Section F.1.b(2)., page 15 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Develop Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans to reduce pollutants and runoff flows from priority development project categories	-	-	-	X	X
	Implement post-construction BMPs for new development and redevelopment	-	X	X	X	X
	Require structural post-construction BMPs to meet design criteria and performance standards	-	-	X	X	X
	Require structural post-construction BMPs for priority development project categories to meet numeric sizing criteria	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop procedure for pollutants of concern to be identified for new development projects	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop a process by which SUSMPs will be implemented	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop a program to manage waivers from SUSMPs	-	-	-	-	X
	Require protection of groundwater resources when BMPs with the primary function of infiltration are used	-	-	-	-	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Construction (Section F.2., page 21 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutant discharges from construction sites	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of pollution prevention methods at construction sites	-	X ¹³	X	X	X
	Update grading ordinances	-	-	-	X	X
	Modify construction and grading approval processes	-	-	-	X	X
	Include conditions of approval in local grading and construction permits to ensure pollutant discharges are reduced to MEP	-	-	X	X	X
	Inventory all construction sites	X ¹⁴	X	-	X	X
	Prioritize construction sites for construction oversight activities	-	X ¹⁵	-	X	X
	Require implementation of designated minimum BMPs at each construction site	X	X	X	X	X

¹³ The Preamble to the Federal NPDES regulations states “[I]n implementing these regulations, EPA and the States will strive to achieve environmental results in a cost effective manner by placing high priority on pollution prevention activities [...]” For this reason, SDRWQCB interprets Federal NPDES regulation requirements for implementation of control measures to include requirements for implementation of pollution prevention control measures. Accordingly, all requirements regarding pollution prevention are “checked” in the Federal NPDES Regulations column.

¹⁴ The language in Order No. 90-42 regarding requirements for pollutant source inventories is very broad. It states “The permittees shall inventory [...] major sources of pollutants such as industrial and military and other federal facilities, airports, highways, shopping centers, and large parking areas.” Staff interprets this language to apply to all land-use areas within each Copermittee’s jurisdiction, including construction, municipal, industrial, commercial, and residential areas. Therefore, all requirements regarding pollutant source inventories are “checked” in the Order No. 90-42 column.

¹⁵ The Federal NPDES regulation requirements for prioritization are broad. They state “Proposed management programs shall describe priorities for implementing controls.” SDRWQCB interprets this language to apply to all land-use areas within each Copermittee’s jurisdiction, including construction, municipal, industrial, commercial, and residential areas. Therefore, all requirements regarding prioritization are “checked” in the Federal NPDES Regulation column.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Require implementation of additional BMPs at construction sites tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) water bodies	X	X	X	X	X
	Inspect construction sites for compliance with ordinances and permits	-	X	X	X	X
	Establish inspection frequencies for construction sites based on their prioritization	-	X	X	X	X
	Inspect high priority construction sites weekly (or monthly if SWPPP has been reviewed and is found to have been implemented)	-	-	-	-	X
	Inspect medium and low priority construction sites twice during the wet season	-	-	-	-	X
	Inspect construction sites as needed during the dry season	-	-	-	-	X
	Enforce ordinances and permits at all construction sites	X ¹⁶	X	X	X	X
	Provide notification to SDRWQCB of non-compliant sites	X ¹⁷	X	X	X	X
	Conduct education efforts focused on construction	-	X	X	X	X
	Educate municipal staff on requirements for construction	-	-	X	X	X
	Educate project applicants, contractors, developers, property owners, etc. on requirements for construction	-	X	X	X	X

¹⁶ The language in Order No. 90-42 regarding enforcement is very broad. It states “[P]ursue enforcement actions as necessary to ensure compliance with the stormwater management programs and the implementation plans.” SDRWQCB interprets this language to apply to all areas within each Copermittee’s jurisdiction, including construction, municipal, industrial, commercial, and residential areas. Therefore, all requirements regarding enforcement are “checked” for Order No. 90-42.

¹⁷ Order No. 90-42 requires reporting of all instances of non-compliance.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Municipal (Section F.3.a., page 24 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutant discharges from municipal areas and activities	X	X	X	X	X
	Reduce impacts on receiving waters from operating and maintaining public streets, roads, and highways	-	X	X	X	X
	Assure that flood management projects assess water quality impacts	-	X	X	X	X
	Implement control measures for discharges of pollutants from municipal waste storage facilities	-	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of pollution prevention methods for municipal areas and activities	-	X	X	X	X
	Inventory all municipal areas and activities which generate pollutants	X	-	-	-	X
	Prioritize municipal areas and activities for oversight	-	X	-	-	X
	Require implementation of designated minimum BMPs for each municipal area or activity	-	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of additional BMPs for municipal areas and activities tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) water bodies	-	X	X	X	X
	Implement a schedule of maintenance activities at all structural controls designed to reduce pollutant discharges to or from the MS4	X ¹⁸	X	X	X	X

¹⁸ The language in Order No. 90-42 regarding maintenance of the MS4 is broad. It states “Permittees shall, at all times, properly maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by a permittee to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order.” Staff interprets this language to apply to consistent periodic maintenance of the entire MS4. Therefore, all requirements regarding maintenance of the MS4 are “checked” for Order No. 90-42.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Implement a schedule of maintenance for the MS4	X	X	X	X	X
	Inspect and remove waste accumulated in the MS4	X	-	X	X	X
	Perform additional MS4 cleaning as necessary	-	-	X	X	X
	Keep records of cleanings and quantity of material removed	-	-	-	X	X
	Dispose of MS4 waste properly	-	-	-	X	X
	Eliminate waste discharges during maintenance and cleaning	-	-	-	X	X
	Implement BMPs to reduce contribution of pollutants associated with the application, storage, and disposal of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers	-	X	X	X	X
	Inspect high priority municipal areas and activities annually	-	-	-	-	X
	Enforce storm water ordinance for all municipal areas and activities	X	X	X	X	X
Industrial (Section F.3.b., page 27 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutants in runoff from industrial sites	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of pollution prevention methods at industrial sites	-	X	X	X	X
	Inventory all industrial sites	X	X	X	X	X
	Prioritize industrial sites for oversight	-	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of designated minimum BMPs for each industrial site	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of additional BMPs for industrial sites tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) water bodies	-	X	X	X	X
	Require monitoring program for runoff from high priority industrial sites	-	X	-	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Inspect industrial sites for compliance with ordinances and permits	-	X	X	X	X
	Establish inspection frequencies for industrial sites based on their prioritization	-	X	X	X	X
	Inspect high priority industrial sites annually (or biannually if SWPPP has been reviewed and is found to have been implemented)	-	-	-	-	X
	Enforce ordinances at all industrial sites	X	X	X	X	X
	Provide notification to SDRWQCB of non-compliant sites	X	X	X	X	X
Commercial (Section F.3.c., page 30 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutants in runoff from commercial sites	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of pollution prevention methods at commercial sites	-	X	X	X	X
	Inventory all high priority commercial sites	X	-	X	X	X
	Require implementation of designated minimum BMPs for each commercial site	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of additional BMPs for commercial sites tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) water bodies	X	X	X	X	X
	Inspect high priority commercial sites as needed	-	-	X	-	X
	Enforce ordinances at all commercial sites	X	X	X	X	X
Residential (Section F.3.d., page 31 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Reduce pollutants in runoff from residential areas and activities	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of pollution prevention methods for residential areas and activities	-	X	X	X	X
	Inventory all high priority residential areas and activities	X	-	-	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Require implementation of designated minimum BMPs for high priority residential areas and activities	X	X	X	X	X
	Require implementation of additional BMPs for residential areas and activities tributary to Clean Water Act section 303(d) water bodies	X	X	X	X	X
	Enforce ordinances for all residential areas and activities	X	X	X	X	X
Education (Section F.4., page 32 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Implement a education program to increase knowledge of MS4s, impacts of urban runoff on receiving waters, and potential BMP solutions	-	X	X	X	X
	Implement education program to measurably change behavior of target communities	-	-	-	X	X
	Educate municipal departments and personnel	-	X	X	X	X
	Educate construction site owners and developers	-	X	X	X	X
	Educate industrial owners and operators	-	-	X	X	X
	Educate commercial owners and operators	-	-	X	X	X
	Educate residential community, general public, school children	-	-	X	X	X
	Educate quasi-governmental agencies	-	-	-	-	X
Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (Section F.5., page 34 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Seek and eliminate illicit discharges and connections	X	X	X	X	X
	Conduct dry weather field screening of MS4 outfalls to detect illicit discharges and connections	X	X	X	X	-
	Conduct dry weather analytical monitoring of MS4 outfalls	-	-	-	-	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Follow-up on potential illicit discharges or connections based on dry weather analytical monitoring	-	X	X	X	X
	Establish criteria to identify where follow-up investigations appropriate	-	-	X	X	X
	Eliminate detected illicit discharges and connections	X	X	X	X	X
	Enforce ordinances, orders, and other legal authority to prevent and eliminate illicit discharges and connections	X	X	X	X	X
	Prevent and respond to sewage spills (including from private laterals) and other spills	X	X	X	X	X
	Develop and implement a mechanism to be notified of all sewage spills from private laterals	-	-	-	-	X
	Facilitate public reporting of illicit discharges and connections through operation of a public hotline	-	X	X	X	X
	Facilitate proper management and disposal of used oil, toxic materials, and other household hazardous wastes	-	X	X	X	X
	Implement controls and measures to limit infiltration of seepage from sanitary sewers to MS4s	-	X	X	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Public Participation (Section F.6., page 35 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Incorporate public participation into urban runoff management plan	-	X	-	X	X
Assessment of Urban Runoff Management Program Effectiveness (Section F.7., page 36 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Develop and implement long-term strategy for assessing effectiveness of the urban runoff management program	X	X	X	X	X
	Assess status of compliance	-	-	-	-	X
Fiscal Analysis (Section F.8., page 36 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Develop a strategy to conduct a fiscal analysis of the urban runoff management program	-	-	-	-	X
	Conduct fiscal analysis annually	X	X	X	X	X
Watersheds (Section J., page 41 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Develop and implement a watershed urban runoff management program	-	X ¹⁹	-	X	X
	Collaborate with other Copermittees in watershed and identify and mitigate highest priority water quality issues in the watershed	-	-	-	X	X
	Create a map of each watershed	-	-	-	X	X
	Assess water quality of all receiving waters in each watershed	-	X ²⁰	-	X	X
	Identify and prioritize water quality problems in each watershed caused by MS4 discharges	-	-	-	X	X

¹⁹ The Federal NPDES regulations state “Proposed programs may impose controls on a [...] watershed basis [...]” (40 CFR 122.26(d)(2)(iv)).

²⁰ The Federal NPDES regulations require an assessment of the quality of receiving waters (40 CFR 122.26(d)(1)(iv)(C)). If the urban runoff management program were to be conducted on a watershed basis, the water quality assessment would also be conducted on a watershed basis.

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	Develop a time schedule of short and long-term recommended watershed activities	-	-	-	X	X
	Identify Copermittees and corresponding responsibilities for each watershed	-	-	-	X	X
	Develop a mechanism for public participation in watershed process	-	-	-	X	X
	Implement a watershed based education program	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop a mechanism to facilitate watershed-based land use planning between Copermittees	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop an implementation schedule for collaborative watershed-based land use planning	-	-	-	-	X
	Assess long-term effectiveness of watershed urban runoff management program	-	X ²¹	-	X	X
Reporting (Sections H., I., L., and M., pages 36 – 44 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Submit description of urban runoff management program	X	X	X	X	X
	Document all urban runoff activities and submit annually	X	X	X	X	X
	Submit description of watershed urban runoff management program	-	X ²²	-	X	X
	Document all watershed urban runoff activities and submit annually	-	X	-	X	X
	Submit report on dry weather monitoring results	X	X	X	X	X
	Submit monitoring report annually	X	X	X	X	X
²¹ If an urban runoff management program is conducted on a watershed basis, the Federal NPDES regulations would require an assessment of the effectiveness of the watershed urban runoff management program. ²² If an urban runoff management program is conducted on a watershed basis, a description of the watershed urban runoff management program would be required.						

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
	All reports shall be signed and certified	X	X	X	X	X
Copermittee Collaboration (Section N., page 44 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Collaborate with other Copermittees to address common issues, promote consistency, and coordinate activities	-	X	X	X	X
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement between the Copermittees	X	X	X	X	X
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement which provides a management structure for designation of joint responsibilities	X	-	X	X	X
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement which designates fiscal responsibilities of Copermittees	X	-	-	X	-
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement which provides a management structure for decision making	-	-	-	X	X
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement which provides a management structure for watershed activities	-	-	-	-	X
	Execute and submit a memorandum of understanding, joint powers authority, or other formal agreement which provides a management structure for information management	-	-	-	X	X
	Jointly develop a standardized format for reports	-	-	-	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Principal Permittee (Section O., page 45 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Serve as a liaison between Copermittees and SDRWQCB	X	-	-	X	X
	Designate Principal Permittee	X	-	-	X	X
	Ensure coordination of permit activities among Copermittees	X	-	-	X	X
	Integrate individual Copermittee documents	X	-	-	X	X
Non-Compliance (Section R.1., page 49 of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Report all instances of non-compliance	X	X	X	X	X
Monitoring (Attachment B of Tentative Order No. 2001-01)	Develop a monitoring program	X	X	X	X	X
	Develop storm water monitoring program	X	X	X	X	X
	Develop urban runoff monitoring program	X	-	-	-	X
	Develop receiving water monitoring program	X	-	X	X	X
	Develop a report that summarizes previous monitoring results	X	-	-	-	X
	Develop a report that recommends future monitoring activities	-	-	-	-	X
	Estimate annual pollutant load of cumulative discharges	-	X	X	X	X
	Conduct urban stream bioassessment monitoring	-	-	-	-	X
	Conduct long-term mass loading monitoring	X	-	X	X	X
	Conduct coastal storm drain monitoring	-	-	-	-	X
	Conduct ambient bay, lagoon, and coastal receiving water monitoring	-	-	X	X	X
	Conduct toxic hot spot monitoring	-	-	X	X	X
	Conduct dry weather field screening	X	X	X	X	X
	Conduct dry weather analytical monitoring	-	-	-	-	X
	Develop map of MS4	X	X	X	X	X

Requirement Category	Requirements	Order No. 90-42 (July, 1990)	Federal NPDES Regulations (November, 1990)	1995 Draft (May, 1995)	1998 Draft (October, 1998)	Tentative Order No. 2001-01 (October, 2000)
Total Number of Requirements (estimate)	187	77	108	121	150	185
Total Number of Pages	-	33 (+ 3)	-	39 (+31)	26 (+17)	50 (+30)